

REMARKS

In the Office Action¹, the Examiner objected to claim 45; rejected claims 41-44 and 46-49 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,661,531 to Murphy et al. ("*Murphy*") in view of U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2004/0070672 to Iwami et al. ("*Iwami*"); allowed claims 1-6, 13-18, 25-30, and 37-39; and indicated that claim 45 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the claim objection and to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant has amended the specification and claims 41, 45, 48, and 49. Claims 1-6, 13-18, 25-30, 37-39, and 41-49 remain pending.

Regarding the amendment to the specification, Applicant has amended to the specification to replace --electronic photography-- with "electrophotography." This amendment has been made to provide an even more accurate translation of the Japanese priority document.

Regarding the objection to claim 45, Applicant has amended claim 45 as suggested by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 41-44 and 46-49 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Murphy* and *Iwami*.

Claims 41-44 and 46-49 require a "page printer" that "uses an electrophotography type process." The claimed "electrophotography type process" is an

¹ The Final Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicant declines to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Final Office Action.

image forming process using a Carlson process. In contrast, the printers disclosed in *Murphy* and *Iwami* are not page printers. They are ink jet printers that can print a page intermittently, and thus can print an image of the page part by part, depending upon the data transfer of the page. The printers disclosed in *Murphy* and *Iwami* does not use "an electrophotography type process." Therefore, the printing operations in *Murphy*, *Iwami*, and *Iida* do not teach or suggest the claimed "page printer" that "uses an electrophotography type process," as recited in claims 41-44 and 46-49.

Accordingly, *Murphy* and *Iwami* fail to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claims 41-44 and 46-49, at least because the references fail to teach or suggest each and every element of the claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: May 20, 2009

By: /David W. Hill/
David W. Hill
Reg. No. 28,220